REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application is directed to non-statutory subject matter under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §101 or is made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 35-51 AND 54-68 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 35-51 and 54-68 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, the Applicant ha s amended claims 35-51 and 54-68, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, to specifically claim a "non-transitory computer-readable medium ..." (emphasis added). In light of this amendment, the Applicant submits that claims 35-51 and 54-68 are clearly directed to statutory subject matter. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 35-51 and 54-68 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17, 20-51 AND 54-79 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17, 20-51, and 54-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Lockwood patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,554,618, issued April 29, 2003, hereinafter "Lockwood") in view of the Ziv-El patent (United States Patent No. 6,302,698, issued October 16, 2001, hereinafter "Ziv-El") and further in view of the Bishop et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,284, issued September 18, 1990, hereinafter "Bishop"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Particularly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Lockwood, Ziv-El, and Bishop fail, singly or in any permissible combination, to disclose or suggest receiving or providing a response to a query, where the response comprises a completed response template that is <u>selected from among a plurality of response templates by the responder</u>, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74, and 79. Specifically, the invention claimed by the Applicant forwards a <u>plurality of response templates</u> to a client device (operated by an exam taker), where <u>each of the forwarded templates may potentially be used to answer the same query</u>. This allows the exam

taker to select which template(s) to use for each part of his or her response to the query, as well how many templates together will form the response. Thus, the exam taker has a degree of control over the form in which he or she uses the response templates to answer the query. This facilitates self-explanation of the exam taker's response to the query, for instance wherein the exam taker attempts to deliberately explain a complex concept in a step-by-step fashion.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Lockwood ... does not specifically disclose the limitations of forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query ..." (Office Action, Page 3) and does not suggest that this feature is disclosed by Ziv-El; however, the Examiner submits that Bishop bridges this gap in the teachings of Lockwood and Ziv-El. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Bishop, by contrast, teaches that the person posing the query (i.e., a survey developer) selects the format for the response. Although Bishop discloses that a query may take one of three different types of formats (i.e., close-ended, open-ended, or hybrid), nowhere does Bishop suggest that the person answering the query may choose which of these formats is used to provide his or her answer (as claimed by the Applicants). Even in the case of the hybrid format, which contains both close-ended and open-ended response formats, the person answering the query does not get to choose that the response format is a hybrid format. Thus the template forwarded to the survey taker for use in answering the query is selected by the developer; the survey taker has no control over the response format that is presented.

The Applicant's claims clearly recite that a response to a query pertaining to a structured entity comprises a completed response template that is selected by the user (answerer) from among a plurality of forwarded templates for answering the query. Lockwood, Ziv-El, and Bishop, as discussed, fail to disclose or suggest this feature. Specifically, Applicant's claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 positively recite:

1.   A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:
       a) forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts;
       b) forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device</u>. (Emphasis added)

21.   A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:

a) receiving a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user providing the response</u>. (Emphasis added)

35.   A non-transitory computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

a) forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) forwarding <u>a plurality of response templates</u> for answering the query; and

c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device</u>. (Emphasis added)

55.   A non-transitory computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

a) receiving a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response</u>

template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user providing the response. (Emphasis added)

69.   An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:
        means for forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts and for forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
        means for receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device</u>. (Emphasis added)

74.   An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:
        means for receiving a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts and for receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
        means for providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the apparatus</u>. (Emphasis added)

79.   A system for providing feedback, said system comprising:
        a first client device; and
        an aggregating device for forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts and a plurality of response templates for answering the query to said first client device, where said aggregating device receives a response from said first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device</u>. (Emphasis added)

As discussed, Lockwood, Ziv-El, and Bishop fail, singly or in any permissible combination, to disclose or suggest receiving or providing a response to a query, where the response comprises a completed response template that is <u>selected from among a plurality of response templates by the responder</u>, as claimed in Applicant's independent

claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74, and 79.

Moreover, Lockwood, Ziv-El, and Bishop also fail to disclose or suggest that <u>the selected response template links a plurality of parts of a structured entity</u>, as also recited by the Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79. The Examiner acknowledges that "Lockwood ... does not specifically disclose the limitations of ... wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity ..." (Office Action, Page 3), and the Examiner does not suggest that this feature is disclosed by Ziv-El; however, the Examiner submits that Bishop bridges this gap in the teachings of Lockwood and Ziv-El. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Bishop discloses a system for processing responses to survey queries, where each query may take one of three formats (close-ended, open-ended, or hybrid). However, nowhere in Bishop is it suggested that a response to any of these queries <u>links multiple parts of a structured entity</u>, as claimed by the Applicant. The portions of Bishop that are cited by the Examiner merely discuss the differences between the three query formats, without regard to any relationship that may exist between the queries or any reference to a structured entity. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Claims 2-17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 depend from independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74, respectively, and recite at least the same patentable features recited in independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that claims 2-17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 are also not made obvious by the teachings of Lockwood in view of Ziv-El and further in view of Bishop. Therefore, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

III. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicant submits that all of the presented claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 542-2280 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2010
Date

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 542-2280

Wall & Tong, LLP
25 James Way
Eatontown, New Jersey 07724